



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,591	12/21/2001	Herbert V. Joiner	NAIIP063/01.305.01	4557
28875	7590	10/26/2005	EXAMINER	
Zilka-Kotab, PC P.O. BOX 721120 SAN JOSE, CA 95172-1120			ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3639	

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/029,591	JOINER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Akiba K. Robinson-Boyce	3639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/10/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Status of Claims***

1. Due to communications filed 8/2/05, the following is a final office action. Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 26, and 28 have been amended. Claims 30-34 have been added. Claims 1-34 are pending in this application and have been examined on the merits. Claims 1-34 are rejected as follows.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-8, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of :

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful art" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

Art Unit: 3639

As to technological arts recited in the preamble, mere recitation in the preamble (i.e., intended or field of use) or mere implication of employing a machine or article of manufacture to perform some or all of the recited steps does not confer statutory subject matter to an otherwise abstract idea unless there is positive recitation in the claim as a whole to breath life and meaning into the preamble.

Claim 1 is directed to "a method for charging for network analysis, and executing on a computer including a computer readable medium". Claim 1 recites "collecting network traffic information... ", "consolidating the network traffic information... ", "reporting on the network traffic information to a user utilizing a plurality of zone... ", "determining a reoccurring fee... ". However, since no computer hardware or software embodied on a tangible medium are in the body of the claim, claim 1 and all claims that depend from it (2-8) are therefore non-statutory.

Claim 25 is directed to "a method for charging for network analysis, and executing on a computer including a computer readable medium". Claim 1 recites "collecting network traffic information... ", "consolidating the network traffic information... ", "reporting on the network traffic information to a user utilizing a plurality of zone... ", "determining a reoccurring fee... ", and "charging the user the reoccurring fee... ". However, since no computer hardware or software embodied on a tangible medium are in the body of the claim, claim 25 is therefore non-statutory.

Claim 26 is directed to "a method for charging for network analysis, and executing on a computer including a computer readable medium". Claim 1 recites "collecting network traffic information... ", "consolidating the network traffic

Art Unit: 3639

information...”, “reporting on the network traffic information to a user utilizing a plurality of zone...”, “determining a fee associated...”. However, since no computer hardware or software embodied on a tangible medium are in the body of the claim, claim 26 is therefore non-statutory.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf et al. (US 6,278,694), in view of Turek et al (US 6,021,439).

As for Claim 1 , Wolf et al. discloses a method comprising:

(a) collecting network traffic information utilizing a plurality of agents (see Fig. 5A; col. 5, lines 12-62),  
(b) consolidating the network traffic information utilizing a plurality of host controllers coupled to the agents (see Fig. 1 ; col. 3, line 16 - col. 2, line 20),, and  
(c) reporting on the network traffic information to a user utilizing a plurality of zone controllers coupled to the host controllers (see Id.; Fig. 7A, 8 for the reporting).

However, Wolf et al. does not expressly discloses the method including charging

a fee for responding based on a number of at least one of the agents, the host controllers, and the zone controllers.

Turek et al. teaches, for a system and method for monitoring and collecting data in a computer network, that the method includes collecting the information in the network and providing network analysis for a "fee" (col. 8, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Wolf et al. such that the invention determines and provides the reporting of Wolf et al. (based on the number of agents, the host controller and the zone controller, i.e. service fee for all the services) for a fee, as taught by Turek et al, for the purpose of providing the reporting service provider with a business incentive to manage on behalf of one or more instrumented Web servers.

As for Claim 2, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the method, including:  
determining the reoccurring fee associated with the reporting based on the number of the agents (see Supra Fig. 1 of Wolf et al).

As for Claim 3, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the method including:  
determining the reoccurring fee associated with the reporting based on the number of the host controllers (see 1d.).

As for Claim 4, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the method including:  
determining the reoccurring fee associated with the reporting based on the number of the zone controllers (see Supra Claim 1).

As for Claim 7, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the method including:  
charging the user the reoccurring fee (see Id.).

Art Unit: 3639

As for Claim 8, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the method including:  
charging the user the recurring fee utilizing a network (it is obvious to charge the user the fee for utilizing a network).

As for Claim 9, Wolf et al. discloses a computer program product for charging for network analysis, comprising:

- (a) code for collecting network traffic information utilizing a plurality of agents (see Fig. 5A; col . 5, lines 12-62)\*,
- (b) code for consolidating the network traffic information utilizing a plurality of host controllers coupled to the agents (see Fig. 1 ; col. 3, line 16 - col. 2, line 20); and
- (c) code for reporting on the network traffic information to a user utilizing a plurality of zone controllers coupled to the host controllers (see Id.; Fig. 7A, 8 for the reporting).

However, Wolf et al. does not expressly discloses the product including code for charging a fee for reporting based on a number of at least one of the agents, the host controllers, and the zone controllers.

Turek et al. teaches, for a system and method for monitoring and collecting data in a computer network, that the invention includes collecting the information in the network and providing network analysis for a "fee" (col. 8, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the product of Wolf et al. such that the invention determines and provides the reporting of Wolf et al. (based on the number of agents, the host controller and the zone controller, i.e. service fee for all the services) for a fee,

Art Unit: 3639

as taught by Turek et al., for the purpose of providing the reporting service provider with a business incentive to manage on behalf of one or more instrumented Web servers.

As for Claim 10, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the product, including:  
code for determining the reoccurring fee associated with the reporting based on  
the number of the agents (see Supra Fig. 1 of Wolf et al.).

As for Claim 11 , the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the product including:  
code for determining the reoccurring fee associated with the reporting based on  
the number of the host controllers (see Id.).

As for Claim 12, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the product including:  
code for determining the reoccurring fee associated with the reporting based on  
the number of the zone controllers (see Supra Claim 1).

As for Claim 15, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the product including:  
code for charging the user the reoccurring fee (see Id.).

As for Claim 16, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the product including:  
code for charging the user the recurring fee utilizing a network (it is obvious to charge  
the user the fee for utilizing a network).

As for Claim 17, Wolf et al. discloses a system comprising'.  
(a) logic for collecting network traffic information utilizing a plurality of agents (see  
Fig. 5A , col . 5, lines 12-62);  
(b) logic for consolidating the network traffic information utilizing a plurality of  
host controllers coupled to the agents (see Fig. 1; col. 3, line 16 - col. 2, line 20), and  
(c) logic for reporting on the network traffic information to a user utilizing a

Art Unit: 3639

plurality of zone controllers coupled to the host controllers (see Id.; Fig. 7A, 8 for the reporting).

However, Wolf et al. does not expressly discloses the system including logic for charging a fee for reporting based on a number of at least one of the agents, the host controllers, and the zone controllers.

Turek et al. teaches, for a system and method for monitoring and collecting data in a computer network, that the invention includes collecting the information in the network and providing network analysis for a "fee" (col. 8, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Wolf et al. such that the invention determines and provides the reporting of Wolf et al. (based on the number of agents, the host controller and the zone controller, i.e. service fee for all the services) for a fee, as taught by Turek et al., for the purpose of providing the reporting service provider with a business incentive to manage on behalf of one or more instrumented Web servers.

As for Claim 18, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the system, including: logic for determining the reoccurring fee associated with the reporting based on the number of the agents (see Supra Fig. 1 of Wolf et al.).

As for Claim 19, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the system including: logic for determining the reoccurring fee associated with the reporting based on the number of the host controllers (see 1d.).

As for Claim 20, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the system including: logic for determining the reoccurring fee associated with the reporting based on

the number of the zone controllers (see Supra Claim 1).

As for Claim 23, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the system including:

logic for charging the user the reoccurring fee (see Id.).

As for Claim 24, the modified Wolf et al. further discloses the system including:

logic for charging the user the recurring fee utilizing a network (it is obvious to charge the user the fee for utilizing a network).

As for Claim 25, Wolf et al. discloses a method comprising:

(a) collecting network traffic information utilizing a plurality of agents (see Fig. 5A; col . 5, lines 12-62)',

(b) consolidating the network traffic information utilizing a plurality of host controllers coupled to the agents (see Fig. 1, col. 3, line 16 - col. 2, line 20); and

(c) reporting on the network traffic information to a user utilizing a plurality of zone controllers coupled to the host controllers (see Id.; Fig. 7A, 8 for the reporting).

However, Wolf et al. does not expressly discloses the method including charging a fee for reporting based on a number of at least one of the agents, the host controllers, and the zone controllers.

Turek et al. teaches, for a system and method for monitoring and collecting data in a computer network, that the method includes collecting the information in the network and providing network analysis for a "fee" (col. 8, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the ad to modify the method of Wolf et al. such that the invention determines and provides the reporting of Wolf et al. (based on the number of agents,

the host controller and the zone controller, i.e. service fee for all the services) for a fee, as taught by Turek et al., for the purpose of providing the reporting service provider with a business incentive to manage on behalf of one or more instrumented Web servers.

As for Claim 26, Wolf et al. discloses a method comprising:

- (a) collecting network traffic information utilizing a plurality of information collectors (see Fig. 5A; col. 5, lines 12-62),,
- (b) consolidating the network traffic information utilizing a plurality of host controllers coupled to the information collectors (see Fig. 1 ; col. 3, line 16 - col. 2, line 20); and
- (c) reporting on the network traffic information to a user utilizing a plurality of zone controllers coupled to the host controllers (see Id.; Fig. 7A, 8 for the reporting).

However, Wolf et al. does not expressly discloses the method including charging a fee for reporting based on a number of at least one of the information collectors, the host controllers, and the zone controllers.

Turek et al. teaches, for a system and method for monitoring and collecting data in a computer network, that the method includes collecting the information in the network and providing network analysis for a "fee" (col. 8, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the ad to modify the method of Wolf et al. such that the invention determines and provides the reporting of Wolf et al. (based on the number of information collectors, the host controller and the zone controller, i.e. service fee for all the services) for a fee, as taught by Turek et al., for the purpose of providing the

reporting service provider with a business incentive to manage on behalf of one or more instrumented Web servers.

As for Claim 27, the modified method of Wolf et al. further discloses the method, wherein the fee is reoccurring.

As for Claim 28, Wolf et al. discloses a computer program product comprising:

(a) code for collecting network traffic information utilizing a plurality of information collectors (see Fig. 5A; col. 5, lines 12-62).,

(b) code for consolidating the network traffic information utilizing a plurality of host controllers coupled to the information collectors (see Fig. 1 ; col. 3, line 16 - col. 2, line 20), and

(c) code for reporting on the network traffic information to a user utilizing a plurality of zone controllers coupled to the host controllers (see Id.', Fig. 7A, 8 for the reporting).

However, Wolf et al. does not expressly discloses the product including code for charging a fee for reporting based on a number of at least one of the information collectors, the host controllers, and the zone controllers.

Turek et al. teaches, for a system and method for monitoring and collecting data in a computer network, that the method includes collecting the information in the network and providing network analysis for a "fee" (col. 8, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the ad to modify the product of Wolf et al. such that the invention determines and provides the reporting of Wolf et al. (based on the number of

information collectors, the host controller and the zone controller, i.e. service fee for all the services) for a fee, as taught by Turek et al., for the purpose of providing the reporting service provider with a business incentive to manage on behalf of one or more instrumented Web servers.

As for Claim 29, the modified product of Wolf et al. further discloses the product, wherein the fee is reoccurring.

6. Claims 30- 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf et al. (US 6,278,694),in view of Turek et al (US 6,021,439), and further in view of Furukawa et al (US 6,145,011).

As per claim 30, neither Wolf et al nor Turek et al disclose wherein the reoccurring fee is based on a tiered system, but Wolf et al does disclose a method for collecting and reporting monitored data for networked traffic in the abstract, lines 1-2.

However, Furukawa et al discloses:

Wherein the reoccurring fee is based on a tiered system, (col. 43, line 13-15, 8-tiered system). Furukawa discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that an 8-tiered system can be incorporated into an information charging system as shown in col. Col. 21, line 66-col. 22, line 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to base a recurring fee on a tiered system with the motivation of allowing different fees to be charged based on tier-level.

As per claim 31, neither Wolf et al nor Turek et al disclose wherein the number of the at least one of the agents, the host controllers, and the zone controllers are set for

each tier, but Wolf et al does disclose a method for collecting and reporting monitored data for networked traffic in the abstract, lines 1-2.

However, Furukawa et al discloses:

wherein the number of the at least one of the agents, the host controllers, and the zone controllers are set for each tier, (Col. 43, lines 13-15, 8-tiered system for classes. Faraway discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing more than one tier for different classes in the system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the number of the at least one of the agents, the host controller, and the zone controller to be set for each tier with the motivation of allowing at least one of the agents, the host controller, and the zone controller to charge a fee according to a specific tier.

As per claim 32, neither Wolf et al nor Turek et al disclose wherein the reoccurring fee is based on a non-linear function, but Wolf et al does disclose a method for collecting and reporting monitored data for networked traffic in the abstract, lines 1-2.

However, Furukawa et al discloses:

wherein the reoccurring fee is based on a non-linear function, ( Col. 21, line 65-col. 22, line 2, network charging system). Faraway discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing charging according to user frames.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the reoccurring fee is based on a non-linear function with the motivation of charging according to a communication value.

Art Unit: 3639

As per claim 33, neither Wolf et al nor Turek et al disclose wherein the reoccurring fee is a monthly fee, but Wolf et al does disclose a method for collecting and reporting monitored data for networked traffic in the abstract, lines 1-2.

However, Furukawa et al discloses:

Wherein the reoccurring fee is a monthly fee, (Col. 22, lines 4-10, constant amount is charging for a certain period [month]). Furukawa et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that certain amounts are charged for certain periods.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the reoccurring fee to be a monthly fee in order to have a fee that is charged consistently on a monthly basis.

As per claim 34, neither Wolf et al nor Turek et al disclose wherein each agent incurs a first reoccurring fee, each host controller incurs a second reoccurring fee grater than the first reoccurring fee, and each zone controller incurs a third reoccurring fee greater than the second reoccurring fee, but Wolf et al does disclose a method for collecting and reporting monitored data for networked traffic in the abstract, lines 1-2.

However, Furukawa et al discloses:

wherein each agent incurs a first reoccurring fee, each host controller incurs a second reoccurring fee grater than the first reoccurring fee, and each zone controller incurs a third reoccurring fee greater than the second reoccurring fee,( Col. 43, lines13-15, 8-tiered system for classes, w/ col. 22, lines 2-4, shows charges are made according amount of information transferred in the ICS user frame, meaning the more

information that is transferred by the user, the higher the charge each time the information is transferred. Faraway discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing more than one tier for different classes in the system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for each host controller to incur a second reoccurring fee greater than the first reoccurring fee, and each zone controller to incur a third reoccurring fee greater than the second reoccurring fee with the motivation of allowing at least one of the agents, the host controller, and the zone controller to charge a fee according to a specific tier.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6,285,748 is cited to show a network traffic control system that generates traffic monitor information by monitoring the network traffic and controls the network traffic based on the traffic monitor information.

US 5,682,482 is cited to show a network architecture for enhanced support network services. The invention includes an operations gateway defined by a number of agents that take responsibility for accomplishing support system related functions.

US 6,539,427 is cited to show a network wherein at least a portion of the network elements report operating information relating to network conditions to a centralized data store.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 8/2/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Due to the amendment filed 8/2/05, the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections for claims 9-24, and 27-29 have been withdrawn, however, claims 1-8 and 25 and 26 still remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as described above in paragraph # 3.

As per claims 1, 9, 17 and 25, the applicant argues that Wolf does not meet applicant's specific claim language, namely that "the network traffic information [is consolidated] utilizing a plurality of host controllers coupled to the agents", but merely discloses monitoring data to a single network manager. However, Wolf discloses that the network manager produces a traffic report for the selected address pairs in col. 8, lines 13-14. This limitation does meet the applicant's claimed "reporting...utilizing a plurality of zone controllers", since the network manager of Wolf contains a memory storage medium that stores three programs in col. 5, lines 1-7. The first program controls polling and processing of polled monitoring data from the probes P1 and P2, while the second program does the same for probe P3, thus demonstrating the fact that this network manager has a plurality of programs that handle network communications for each probe, thus handling different zones.

Also, with respect to independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, the applicant argues that Turek does not disclose "determining a reoccurring fee", but merely discloses managing quality-of-service information on behalf of one or more instrumented Web servers. However col. 8, lines 38-45 discloses that *the distribution for a fee* occurs on

Art Unit: 3639

behalf of one or more instrumented Web servers, meaning that these fees reoccur since more than one Web server needs to be accommodated. Since these fees are determined according to Web server, and the Web server handles the communication in the network, the fee is therefore associated with the agents, the host controller and zone controllers.

With respect to independent claims 26 and 28, the applicant argues that Turek does not disclose "determining a fee associated with the distributed network analysis based on a number of the information collectors". However, this limitation is disclosed in Turek as described above in the preceding paragraph.

For the reasons stated above, previous rejections made have been maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday 8:30am-5pm, and Wednesday, 8:30 am-12:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7238 [After final communications, labeled "Box AF"], 703-746-7239 [Official Communications], and 703-746-7150 [Informal/Draft Communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"].

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

*ARB*

A. R. B.  
October 17, 2005

*John W. Hayes*  
JOHN W. HAYES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER